

Serial No.

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough review of the present application, and respectfully request reconsideration in light of the preceding amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1-5 have been amended to better define the claimed invention. New claims 6-20 have been added to provide Applicants with the scope of protection to which they are believed entitled. The amended/new claims find solid support in the application as filed, especially Figs. 5-6 and the corresponding text in the original specification. The Abstract has been revised to comply with commonly accepted US patent practice. No new matter has been introduced through the foregoing amendments.

The art rejections of claims 1-5 as being anticipated by or obvious primarily over *Park* (KR 10-0292089) are noted. The reference corresponds to KR 2000-000244 cited as D1 in the International Search Report of the PCT parent of the instant application. Therefore, the reference is believed patentably distinguishable from the present invention as correctly held by the International Examining Authority in its International Preliminary Examination Report.

As to independent claim 1, *Park* does not fairly teach or suggest the claimed HLR furnishing a call-originating exchanger with information on whether or not an RBT is to be replaced for a called terminal. In *Park*, HLR 300 (Fig. 3) furnishes no such information to call-originating exchanger 200. The information is stored and handled by another part of the *Park* system, i.e., call-terminating exchanger 400. *See*, for example, *Park* at page 18, lines 14-18 and page 14, lines 7-8.

Further, *Park* does not fairly teach or suggest the claimed call-originating exchanger searching for a sound code assigned to the called terminal based on the information included in the response message, as recited in independent claim 1. As disclosed at S1500 in Fig. 3 of *Park*, it is the call-terminating exchanger 400 that searches for a replacement tone or sound, rather than a

Serial No.

sound code. *See*, for example, *Park* at page 19, lines 5, 13.

Finally, *Park* does not fairly teach or suggest the claimed call-originating exchanger providing the caller with a pre-stored RBT-replacing sound associated with the found sound code as an RBT while requesting a trunk connection to a call-terminating exchanger associated with the called terminal based on the response message. In *Park*, the RBT-replacing sound is provided to the caller at S2200 (Fig. 3) not while requesting a trunk connection as presently claimed, but well after the trunk connection request was made at S1400.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is patentable over *Park*.

As to independent claim 2, *Park* does not fairly teach or suggest the claimed HLR furnishing a call-terminating exchanger... with information on whether or not an RBT is to be replaced for the called terminal. Note, again the discussion *supra* with respect to claim 1.

Further, *Park* does not fairly teach or suggest the claimed call-terminating exchanger providing the caller... with a pre-stored RBT-replacing sound associated with the found sound code as an RBT. As best seen at S2200 in Fig. 3 of *Park*, the RBT-replacing sound is provided by IP 600, rather than by call-terminating exchanger 400 as presently claimed.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 2 is patentable over *Park*.

Claims 3-10 depend from claim 1 or 2, and are considered patentable at least for the reasons advanced with respect to the respective independent claims. The dependent claims are also patentable on their own merits since these claims recite other features neither disclosed, taught nor suggested by the applied art.

For example, as to claims 3 and 5, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's

Serial No.

interpretation of the applied reference. Specifically, *Park* does not teach or suggest any sound code, contrary to the claimed invention.

As to claims 7 and 9, the applied references, especially *Park*, do not teach or suggest locally storing a plurality of RBT-replacing sounds in a database of the call-originating or call-terminating exchanger. Since the claimed invention stores RBT-replacing sounds in a call-originating exchanger (claim 1) or a call-terminating exchanger (claim 2), a stored sound can be provided from the exchanger without requiring an additional call process even if only a sound code is obtained. By storing the RBT-replacing sounds locally at the exchangers, only a sound code, which is rather small in size compared with an entire replacement sound, needs to be retrieved, thereby greatly reducing traffic and/or easing bandwidth requirement. The claimed invention is thus advantageous over the *Park* system where the replacement sound has to travel across one or more networks, at S2200 in Fig. 3, from IP 600 to call-originating exchanger 200. Further, since *Park* stores a sound source in an IP, which is not a conventional element of a mobile communication network, it requires an additional call process for obtaining routing information to the IP, which stores the requested sound, in order to provide the requested sound.

As such, since the claimed invention has a simple call process to provide a sound in comparison with *Park*, the claimed invention achieves the effect that the time period required for providing the sound and traffic through the entire system can be reduced.

As to claim 8, the applied references, especially *Park*, do not teach or suggest that the response message returned from the HLR to the call-originating exchanger includes not only said information but also routing information furnished by the call-terminating exchanger. By combining the RBT replacement subscription information in the same message with the routing information, the number of required messages can be greatly reduced which is not deemed achievable in *Park*.

Serial No.

As to claim 10, the applied references, especially *Park*, do not teach or suggest the claimed HLR maintaining, for each subscriber, a profile that includes information on whether or not an RBT is to be replaced for the subscriber when called. As note above, *Park* at page 18, lines 14-18 and page 14, lines 7-8 requires that any such information/profile be maintained at the called switching system, i.e., call-terminating exchanger 400. The reference effectively teaches away from the claimed arrangement.

New independent claim 11 includes limitations similar to certain limitations of claims 1, 2, 7 and 9, and is therefore believed patentable over the applied art of record for the respective reasons advanced *supra*.

Claims 12-20 depend from claim 11, and are considered patentable at least for the reasons advanced with respect to claim 11. The dependent claims are also patentable on their own merits since these claims recite other features neither disclosed, taught nor suggested by the applied art, as discussed above with respect to one or more of claims 3 and 7-10.

Each of the Examiner's rejections has been traversed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are now in condition for allowance. Early and favorable indication of allowance is courteously solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

Serial No.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
LOWE HAUPTMAN & BERNER, LLP
/Yoon S Ham/
Yoon S. Ham
Registration No. 45,307

Customer Number: 22429
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: July 6, 2007
YH/KL/jr